

### REMARKS

The appeal in the above-identified application has been withdrawn and applicants have concurrently filed a Request for Continued Examination so that the Examiner may consider this Amendment.

#### 1. Declaration

A substitute Declaration was filed August 19, 2003. Applicants request that the Examiner acknowledge the acceptability of the substitute Declaration.

#### 2. Claim Rejections

Claims 1 – 6, 10 – 13, and 15 – 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,057,677 (“Bertagna”) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,003,008 (“Postrel”); Claims 7 – 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Bertagna and Postrel further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,367,452 (“Gallery”); and Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Bertagna and Postrel further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,873,069 (“Reuhl”).

The independent claims have been amended to clarify the distinction between the security drawer and the security drawer assembly, which now includes specifically recited structural components for mounting the security drawer within the security drawer assembly. The claims require that the security drawer *assembly* be removably mounted in the service cart and that the body of the security drawer *assembly* not be removable from the service cart when the security *drawer* is in the locked position. Support for these limitations is provided in U.S. Pat. Appl. No. 09/652,086 (now U.S. Pat. No. 6,619,770), which has been incorporated by reference (Application, p. 7, l. 13) and a copy of which was provided with the Amendment filed

June 17, 2003. Neither Bertagna nor Postrel discloses a security drawer assembly that is removably mounted in a service cart and having the now specifically recited limitations.

In addition, Applicants note that there is no motivation to combine Bertagna with Postrel in the manner claimed. The Examiner has previously noted language in Postrel that expresses the desire to have a portable point-of-sale device suitable for use on an aircraft or other vehicle that transports passengers. But Postrel specifically teaches a device constructed "to allow the POS device to be *carried on top of* a standard aircraft aisle trolley ... of the type commonly used for beverage service, meal service and for duty-free sales" (Postrel, Col. 5, ll. 36 – 40, emphasis added). There is no teaching or suggestion in Postrel of having a security drawer assembly *removably mounted in the service cart* in such a fashion that the body of the assembly cannot be removed when the security drawer is in a locked position. The specific teaching of Postrel to construct the device merely to be carried on top of a service cart teaches away from these claim limitations, a factor that has long been recognized as evidence that the proposed modification is *not* obvious.


Examination of the claims as amended is respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Patrick M. Boucher  
Reg. No. 44,037

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834

Appl. No. 09/653,498  
Response dated April 5, 2004

PATENT

Tel: 303-571-4000  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
PMB:pmb  
60181307 v1